



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

No. 53 is the celebrated Pyrrhus inscription, which supplements the information given by Plutarch, *Per.* 13, in an interesting manner.

No. 52 is the inscription found *in situ*, on the Athenian Acropolis, upon the pedestal of Strongylion's famous bronze "wooden" horse (δόρυριος ἵππος Ἀθήνησι ἐν ἀκροπόλει χαλκοῦς ἔστιν), which is several times mentioned in ancient writers (Aristoph. *Av.* 1128; Paus. I 23, 8; Hesychius, *s. v.* δόρυριος), and is perhaps copied in one or two vase-paintings.

The examples might be multiplied, but enough have been cited to show the variety and the range of information afforded by a study of the inscriptions. Loewy's work is marked by extraordinary industry and thoroughness, and, so far as we have observed, by most praiseworthy accuracy. The treatment of the Sigeum inscription (Aesopus and his brothers), of that of Paonius of Mende with the Nike, of that of Pyrrhus already mentioned, of those of Leochares and Sthennis, of the Theban inscription of Polycleitus and Lysippus, of the inscription supposed by some to belong to the Aphrodite of Melos, of the puzzling Pergamene inscriptions, deserve especial mention for their fullness and exhaustiveness.

In the present stage of Greek epigraphy the careful and complete facsimiles furnished by Loewy give his treatise a peculiar value to the student of inscriptions. These facsimiles present in chronological sequence typical specimens of the writing of Greek upon stone practised between the sixth century B. C. and the time of the Roman emperors. But though the work will thus be found a convenient manual for the epigrapher, it will be chiefly valuable to the archaeologist. It must soon become indispensable to him, both for the epigraphic material furnished upon ancient sculpture and for the full and exact bibliographical indications on all points.

J. H. WRIGHT.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles: Founded Mainly on the Materials Collected by the Philological Society. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY, LL. D. Part II. Ant-Batten. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1885. Pp. 353-704.

The preface to the second part of the New English Dictionary is dated September, 1885, though it was not received until early in the current year. In it Dr. Murray expressed the hope that the end of Part III, finishing B, might be reached early in 1886, but it is not yet (December) heard from. It is scarcely possible to gauge the time and labor requisite to complete 352 large quarto pages, three columns to the page, of fine print, contained in each part of this monumental work. While consisting of the same number of pages, the second part contains more words than the first, already noticed in this Journal (V 361), namely, 9135, against 8365, and from the number of words treated under A, 15,123, Dr. Murray estimates that the whole Dictionary will contain "upwards of 240,000 words, the main articles being 195,000, the subordinate articles 28,000, and the combinations or compounds requiring separate explanation 18,000." This will give the reader some idea of the comprehensiveness of the work, far surpassing everything that we have heretofore conceived of. Out of this extensive vocabulary, if the same proportion is maintained, 28½ per cent. of the words treated are obsolete, so that the

vocabulary of present English may be estimated at upwards of 170,000 words. I believe that this is about fifty per cent. more than the number of words treated in any existing English Dictionary, the Encyclopaedic Dictionary (Cassell & Co.), which claims 150,000 words, being not yet completed. The number of compound words that have been introduced during the present century is remarkable. Under *Anti-* we find upwards of 130 words for which no earlier example than one from the present century is given, so that, judging by this example, the modern tendency is to form new combinations, especially of words derived from the classical languages.

This part is characterized by the same minuteness of definition and historical treatment of derivation as the former, and whenever the etymology of a given word is not satisfactorily known, the editor does not hesitate to say so; hence we are saved from much etymologizing "in the air."

I naturally looked to see whether any further example of Shakspeare's *Aroint* (Macb. I, iii, 6 and Lear, III, iv, 129) had been discovered, but none is given except from his imitators, and the Brownings seem to have taken liberties with the word peculiarly characteristic of these two poets. I should be glad to see some one justify Mrs. Browning's "*arointed*" and Browning's "*aroints*"; such verbal manufacture cannot be permitted even to great poets. Dr. Murray prudently says: "The origin of Shakspeare's *aroynt* has been the subject of numerous conjectures, none of which can be said to have even a *prima-facie* probability (cf. also *Arunt*)"; and then follow the usual citations in Shaksperian notes of *Rynt ye, Rynt you, Ryndta*, Cheshire and Lancashire phrases, which are explained as but dialectic forms of "round thee," etc., and the identity with Shakspeare's word is denied. Under *Arunt* we are no nearer an explanation; we find "Etymol. unknown," and two examples; in the first, from *Richard the Redeles*, III 221 (1399), the reading is doubtful: "? Arounted [MS has arountyd] ffor his ray [= array, dress] and rebuked ofte"; and in the second, from *Dives et Pauper*, VII, iv, 280 (1496): "Not to arunt them ne rebuke them ne chyde them," the meaning given, "rail at, revile, scold," suits the context very well, as it does also in the first example, so that we get no support for "? to drive away," and it was scarcely worth while to refer to "Shakspeare's *Aroint*."

If now we look back to *Arout*, we are no nearer a decision. Here we find: "A doubtful word, the reading and sense being uncertain in both quotations. The first may be read *arounted*: see *Arunt*, or *a-routed* from *route*; the second reads *route* in all the early MSS. If *arout* existed, it might represent O. F. *arouter*, to start (one) on his way, send away, f. *à*, to \div *route*." The first example is the same one from *Richard the Redeles*, which is accommodating enough to do duty for both *Arout* and *Arunt*; and the second is from Chaucer's Man of Lawes Tale, 442 (ed. Urry): "In all that lond no Christin durst arout," where the Six-Text (Chaucer Society edition) gives "no Christen dorstē route," which is the reading in Tyrwhitt and other editions, and Bell gives "no Christen men durst route," defining *route* as "to assemble together," which suits the sense. Hone, commenting on the word (Ancient Mysteries Described, 1823, p. 145), says that "the letter *a* is prefixed by Urry" for the sake of the measure. At all events, the reading of the Six-Text ought to settle it, so that we get no support here for *Arout*, and if the word in *Richard the Redeles* is *Arunt*, as seems most likely, *Arout* should be excluded from the Dictionary.

While on this word we may notice further Hone's discussion of "Hearne's Print of the Descent into Hell," of which he gives an engraving, and says: "The original copper-plate of Christ's Descent into Hell, engraved by Michael Burghers, from an ancient drawing, for Hearne the antiquary, being in existence, I have caused impressions to be taken from it and inserted one opposite. This print is raised into importance by Dr. Johnson['s] taking it as an authority for *aroint*, a word used twice by Shakspeare." This is a very curious old print, and represents Christ (not St. Patrick, as Dr. Johnson says) leading souls, Adam and the saints, from hell-mouth, with the devil-porter blowing a horn and shouting, "*Out, out, arouzt*," which Johnson read as *arongt*, and immediately jumped to the conclusion that it "is evidently the same with *aroint*, and used in the same sense in this passage." Steevens corrected Johnson as to the subject of the print, being none other than the well-known "Harrowing of Hell," but let his misreading of the outcry remain; "and it is further remarkable," says Hone, "that every subsequent editor of Shakspeare has also acquiesced in Johnson's opinion without taking pains to examine the ground he rests it upon." I may add that this error has continued to the present day, for Mr. Rolfe, in his edition of "Macbeth," simply follows Steevens and gives the words as "Out, out, aroynt," as if Johnson had read "*areynt*." Dr. Furness also, in his Variorum edition, quotes Johnson, but does not correct his error. Hone has consulted Hearne and shown very conclusively that he read *arougt*, not *arongt*, although the word is so misprinted twice in Hone himself (pp. 143-4). It is hard to tell from the old black-letter type whether the letter is *n* or *u*, but Hearne had seen the original, and he gives it as "in our vernacular tongue, *out, out, arougt*," which Hone then assumes to be correct, especially as it rimes with *Out, out*. He next examines both Urry's and Tyrwhitt's readings of Chaucer (*loc. cit.*), and concludes that Chaucer gives no support to *arout*, and he suggests that the *arouzt* of the print is a contraction of the ordinary exclamation of devils, "*harrow, out*," made by the scribe "to avoid an unseemly projection into the margin"; for *harrow* is found as *harro* in the Newcastle play of Noah's Ark, and, I may add, in the Towneley version of the "Harrowing of Hell."¹

Whether this contraction ever occurs I cannot say, but it is at least plausible. However, another explanation may be suggested. The exclamation, "out, out, harrow!" is very common in the Mystery Plays, and is put into the mouth of Lucifer, of Noah's wife, and of the devils in general in the "Harrowing of Hell." It appears in the forms Owte, owte! harrowe! (York Plays, I 97), we, owte! herrowe! (IX 99), owte! ay, herrowe! (XI 403), and in the Towneley version of XXXVII, Out, harro, out (125), and Out, harro (185 and 196). I find no example without the *h*, but from analogy this may well have been dropped, as we have *andyper* for *and hither* (IX 215), *ooste* for *host* (XI 366), *arme* for *harm* (XIII 101). The old character ȝ represents *g*, *h*, *gh*, and *w*, and it is not uncommon to find *t* irregularly added to words, especially after *th* and *gh*, for we find *botht* (XI 232), *on heght* (XIII 29), *burght* (XV 87), *kytht* and *litht* (XVII 146 and 148), and Hone gives *noht* for *not* (p. 46, 2), so that *arouzt* in the old plate may merely be for *harrow* itself, and the porter of hell is using

¹ Hone quotes Jamieson respecting *harro*, who says that "it is an outcry for help, and that it seems to be merely the French word *haro*, or *harou*, a cry used by the Normans," and "when raised against a capital offender, all were bound to pursue and seize him." Chaucer and Langland both use the word, and Brachet marks it "origin unknown."

the common ejaculation that his fellows use in the play as Christ enters the gates of hell. *Aroust* does not occur in the Dictionary, except as pp. of *aracche*, to explain.

But to note a few other words. Under *Bad* we find that the editor prefers the etymology suggested, "with great probability," by Prof. Zupitza—who sees in M. E. *badde* the O. E. *baeddel*, hermaphrodite, with *l* dropped, as in *muchel*, from O. E. *mycel*—to that suggested by Sarrazin from *gebæded*, forced, oppressed. He says: "No other suggestion yet offered is of any importance; the Celtic words sometimes compared are out of the question." So, too, under *Basket*, which has long been derived from a Celtic *basgawd*, and identified with Latin *bascauda*, used by Juvenal and Martial, he says, on the authority of Prof. Rhys, that "*basgawd* is a figment invented to suggest *bascauda*," and that the modern Celtic words "cannot phonetically be descended from an original *bascauda*, but seem to be simply adopted from English. At present, therefore, there is no evidence to connect *basket* with *bascauda*, or to refer it to a Celtic origin." Much other interesting information may be gained from a study of this Dictionary, but I can only commend it to scholars and the public generally, and express the hope that the successive parts may appear at less prolonged intervals.¹

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Anglo-Saxon Reading Primers: I. Selected Homilies of Aelfric. II. Extracts from Alfred's Orosius. Edited by HENRY SWEET, M. A. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press, 1885.

The titles of these two little volumes explain themselves. The series is intended, as Mr. Sweet says, "to give extracts from the more important works of Old English literature in a convenient and easily accessible form, and in a moderate compass. The want of such a series has often been felt by students who have worked through my Anglo-Saxon Primer and Reader, and are at a loss for further reading." The trouble at most colleges in this country is to induce students to study Anglo-Saxon long enough to work through Mr. Sweet's Reader, but for those who have accomplished this, these Primers supply very useful selections. The first volume consists of ten Homilies of Aelfric (74 pages), with a brief glossary (6 pages), and the second of twenty-two selections from Alfred's Orosius (72 pages), with the Latin original of a few, three pages of explanatory notes, and four pages of glossary.

The first are taken from the Cambridge MS, printed by Thorpe, and the second from the Lauderdale MS, which, with the Cotton MS, is contained in Mr. Sweet's edition of Orosius for the E. E. T. Society. The glossaries are the briefest possible. It is gratifying to know that there is a demand for Anglo-Saxon prose texts for translation by students, and Mr. Sweet's two little volumes, in their cheap and convenient form, are well suited to supply it. We cannot be sufficiently grateful to the delegates of the Clarendon Press for their continued zeal in the promotion of English studies by the publication of Old and Middle English works for the use of students. I desire, however, to renew a suggestion made in this Journal (VI 355) that Mr. Sweet's Anglo-

¹ Reference may be made to the notices of Part I in *Anglia*, Anz. VII 1, and Anz. VIII 8, and *Englische Studien*, VIII 120, and of Part II in *Englische Studien*, IX 466.